



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/774,978

02/09/2004

Tilman Lorenz

2001P18006WOUS

9576

46726

7590

06/05/2008

BSH HOME APPLIANCES CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
100 BOSCH BOULEVARD
NEW BERN, NC 28562

EXAMINER

PERRIN, JOSEPH L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1792

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/05/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/774,978 | Applicant(s) LORENZ ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Joseph L. Perrin, Ph.D. | Art Unit 1792 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph L. Perrin, Ph.D, USPTO. (3)_____.

(2) John J. Dresch, applicant representative. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 03 June 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 19,21,26-29 and 37-50.

Identification of prior art discussed: YOUN, BUGNACKI and SMITH.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Dresch discussed the independent claims and argued against the 103 rejection(s). While each position (applicant and USPTO) was clarified, no agreement was reached. Mr. Dresch further discussed the structural limitations of dependent claims 37 and 43 (and claims dependent thereon), which appeared to be persuasive and allowable over the prior art of record and would be reconsidered upon submission of the next response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Joseph L. Perrin/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required